

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated November 30, 2010, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were identified as containing allowable subject matter and if rewritten or amended to overcome the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, would be allowable.

### **I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In the Office Action dated November 30, 2010, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner indicated that the language pertaining to “previous iterations” requires clarification. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 12 to clarify that for each removed vertex with a connectivity count equaling zero, a grouping is returned, the grouping consisting of the removed vertex with a connectivity count equaling zero and all its neighboring vertices previously removed from the graph based upon their connectivity counts and the connectivity counts of their neighbors. Support for the amendment is found in Paragraph 0016 and Fig. 2, item 52. No new matter has been added with the amendment presented herewith.

Furthermore, on December 10, 2010, Applicant’s Attorney and Examiner Dohm had two interviews to discuss a proposed set of amendments to claims 1, 7, and 12. After the first interview, Applicant’s Attorney reviewed the pending application and revised the claim amendment proposal. During the second interview of the same date, Examiner Dohm agreed that the proposed amendments overcome the rejection of record. Accordingly, as the claim amendments submitted herewith are in compliance with the proposed claim amendments of the second interview of December 10, 2010, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and grant an allowance of claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the forgoing amendment and remarks to the claims, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims in their prior forms are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claims are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

For the reasons outlined above, an allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
By: /Rochelle Lieberman/  
Rochelle Lieberman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.39,276

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC  
802 Still Creek Lane  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-3218  
Phone: (301) 948-7775  
Fax: (301) 948-7774  
email: [rocky@legalplanner.com](mailto:rocky@legalplanner.com)  
Date: January 31, 2011